



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	City of Turlock	County	Stanislaus
Project Title	Hydrogeologic Characterization of the Eastern Turlock Subbasin	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 250,000.00

Project Description: The project conducts a detailed hydrogeologic characterization of a 115 square-mile portion of the eastern Turlock Subbasin. The project results in a comprehensive updated hydrogeologic conceptual model for the aquifers and groundwater system and the collection of crucial information, including land use changes and changes in groundwater use in the region.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	4
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	38

- **GWMP or Program:** The Applicant supplied a copy of the resolution showing that the City of Turlock formally adopted the Turlock Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan on February 26, 2008. A copy of the Resolution (No. 2008-047) is provided in Attachment 3 of the application.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to Be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant offers a complete and detailed description where they propose to fill data gaps by performing a comprehensive hydrogeologic characterization of the eastern Turlock Sub-basin. The main goal of the project includes “developing an understanding of the hydrogeology of the project area and to apply that understanding to predict impacts of increased groundwater use on Sub-basin groundwater levels and quality.” Given the conceptual nature of the proposed project, mostly comprised of updating and building upon models, no facilities will be needed. The Applicant supplies a map of the area to show the location of data gaps that the Applicant’s proposal will attempt to fill, and demonstrates collaboration in a number of aspects. The Turlock Groundwater Basin Association (TGBA) will monitor progress and serve as a Project Advisory Committee (PAC). In addition, the Applicant explains that project communication will occur with CDPH, CVRWQCB and the Drinking Water Division of Sacramento County. The Applicant demonstrates long-term need for the project by explaining that it will help to address persistent water level decline in the Sub-basin, in light of identified significant knowledge gaps and changing land use conditions. The Applicant indicates ongoing funding for the proposal will supported by TGBA, local public agencies, and other sources.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant’s Work Plan describes in sufficient detail, what will be done and what the product will be. The project consists of the data gathering in support of both a Hydrological Conceptual Model and sub-basin numerical model. The findings will be compiled in a Final Report. The proposal is consistent with both the Schedule and Budget. In addition, the proposed tasks will reasonably fulfill the five main objectives outlined in the Project Description section and will support five specific BMOs defined in their GWMP. The applicant presents a sound strategy for evaluating progress by outlining a process to submit Technical Memoranda as deliverables for each task, as well as Quarterly Reports that explain progress. The Applicant provides an adequate explanation for why access to private property will not be necessary for the Project. The applicant explains that dissemination will be achieved through the PAC and their local meetings with stakeholders, and the Applicant explains that both CEQA compliance and environmental permitting will not be necessary given that the Project is a study and that includes no construction or facilities.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The applicant does not consistently provide documentation to support all indicated cost items. For example, tasks 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 include various amounts of 'Other Direct Costs' which are not explained or supported in the budget narrative or in the Work Plan for the related tasks. The Proposal includes a "communications fee" estimated at 2% of all professional labor, but the applicant provides little explanation of the basis of the fee. Also, "administrative assistant" fees of \$41, \$82, or \$164 are added to each task and the applicant does not document what cost the fee will cover. The Budget is consistent with and supported by both the Work Plan and Schedule. Grant share is adequately broken down by task and the grant will entirely fund the proposal.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant's Schedule includes timelines that seem optimistic but realistic given the amount of work. In addition, all sequencing is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget. The Schedule presents narratives to explain how the Schedule was derived, and indicates tasks will be complete within a two-year window. Finally, the Applicant adequately describes that it will be ready to proceed immediately upon the execution of the Agreement.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Quality Assurance Program includes well-defined project-specific data quality objectives and appropriate QA/QC measures. The Applicant includes sufficient procedural assurances that the review of reports will ensure a level of quality. In addition, the Applicant describes the use of specific statistical analysis for their established model standards.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Applicant explains that they are capable of performing high quality work, managing funds, and meeting deadlines for other types of projects, but does not provide adequate documentation to support these claims. For example, although the Applicant includes documents related to a past project involving the clean-up of contaminated groundwater, this information does not specifically confirm that they are capable of completing a project on schedule and within the budget.